

WILLIAM M. DAVIES, JR. CAREER AND TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL
50 Jenckes Hill Road, Lincoln, RI 02865

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
November 14, 2016

Minutes were approved at the March 13, 2017 Board of Trustees meeting.

I. Routine

A. Call Meeting to Order

At 8:10 a.m., Mr. Harold Burns, 2nd Vice-Chairperson, called the meeting to order.

B. Attendance

Davies' Executive Assistant called the roll of the Board.

Members Present: Harold Burns, 2nd Vice-Chairperson; Raymond Chartier; David Marquis;
James Segovis, Ph.D.

Members Absent: Larry Gemma; Robert Halkyard; Carolyn Kyle, Chairperson; George Nee; Paul
Ouellette, 1st Vice-Chairperson; John Quinn

Others Present: Victoria Gailliard-Garrick, Director; Joanne Andrews; Gerry Manning;
Nicole Silvia; Susan Paquin, Susan Tierney

C. Approval of Minutes

*Due to no quorum present, approval of the October 12, 2016 minutes was deferred until the
December meeting.*

**D. Recess to Executive Session Pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to Discuss Pending
Litigation and Personnel Issues**

Recess into Executive Session was postponed until the end of the agenda.

E. Return to Regular Session

N/A at this time.

F. Opportunity for Audience to Comment

N/A

II. Business Agenda

A. Finance Report – C. Carroll, Business Office Coordinator

There was no report.

B. Human Resources Report – Joanne Andrews, Human Resources Coordinator

Report was given in Executive Session.

III. Informational Time/Program Update

A. Director's Report

1) Davies Teachers' Association

No representation present.

2) Davies Teacher Assistants' Association

No representation present.

3) Future Student Night – November 10th – Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

Over the last two or three years, there has been a major concern. We have been pretty much shut out of the middle schools. Last year it was Pawtucket with all three of their middle schools and that continues to be the case. They did provide us with the mass mailing labels from two of the middle schools: Goff and Jenkes, not Slater. This year North Providence did the same. They did not allow us to go into the middle schools nor did they give us the labels.

In spite of these roadblocks, our Guidance Counselors and Ms. Masterson, Communication and Marketing Specialist, did an outstanding job. Ms. Masterson got on Facebook and Twitter. She did a promoted post where you have to pay for it to be blasted out on Facebook. The Guidance Counselors were out in the communities with the posters and lawn signs. We had over 1100 students and parents come through the door, more than last year. We are finding other means to get the word out about Davies. The first of the four admissions testing dates is this Saturday that the prospective students need to register for either at Future Student Night, placing a call to our Guidance Dept., or on the school's website.

Mr. Marquis asked how many do we get for the freshman class. Usually we test about 600 with 400 -460 that are eligible. We accept about 250 out of that. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick wishes she could take all of them, but we just do not have the capacity. Is there a trend that parents are looking at career and tech differently now? Yes, it isn't the parents that don't want to send their kids here; it is the schools/districts. The parents are looking at the programs/courses we offer here. Our biggest drawer is the Health Careers Program, Pre-Engineering and Robotics, Graphic Arts and Interactive Media and they are also looking at our academic standards as well. When you can get a combination of both, why not, especially if they are coming out of Pawtucket or Central Falls, and we are getting more kids out of North Providence as well. It's an up-hill battle but we are winning it so far.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick was a bit concerned because North Providence didn't allow us in to do presentations and didn't give us the labels, so she didn't know what to expect last Thursday. She asked our IT Coordinator, Susan Tierney, to contact RIDE to see if we could get the labels from them. It went up the ladder to Steve Osborne and he is trying to figure out why the superintendents are not allowing us to go into those schools. She told him that we all know the answer. They all want to keep the students in their own districts. This is why all the sub-committee work that is going on, we need to look at the quality of the programs and not programs that are electives vs actual tech prep programs. Hopefully after we get through the whole process of standardizing these programs—the operational program standards are in place, we will be able to apply for the categorical funding. It is now competitive. We are in a good position because Davies, historically, has been a great technical school. We continue to provide good outcomes and we have made changes to the work-based learning program, something they will be looking at as well. It will consist of having to revise the grading policy also. We are in a good position especially with the CTE Board.

4) Secondary School Regulations - Nicole Silvia, Interim Supervisor of Academic Instruction
See Supplemental Material: "Amended Elementary and Secondary Regulations – Revisiting current supporting structures and reframing to meet proficiency and efficiency"

RIDE has made some changes to the high school regulations. They look to be subtle but they are not. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick and Ms. Silvia made an assessment of what we are currently doing and digested what the changes are and defined what they actually mean. Ms. Silvia presented the amendments of the secondary regs to the staff during a Professional Development Day last week and she was ask to present to the Board today as well.

Even though the amendments are subtle, the deeper you dig into them, the more complicated and foggy they get. She chose to break them down into three major changes that affects Davies. She then defined them and determined what Davies will do to meet these new regulations. The way she approached it with the staff was that we need to revisit our current supports that we provide here, but we also need to take a step back and look at reframing how we look at and approach a lot of our supports. Davies does offer a lot of what these regulations want every school to do, but maybe those supports don't measure what RIDE is asking for. There is a lot of zooming in and a lot of zooming out with this revisiting and reframing.

The first major change is ensuring grade level literacy and numeracy for all secondary RI students. This is going to take place in two forms. One is assessing and improving literacy and numeracy proficiency and the second is documenting data. There are the assessments that ensure every student is meeting proficiency on an ELA standard, on a math standard, is going to take a lot of documenting. Immediately, as an educator, as an administrator, you say, "there is the gradebook; there is the documentation." Parents, students, teachers, and administrators have access to the gradebook. Then you have to say, "how accurate are the grades; do the grades that we report out here at Davies truly measure proficiency?" The answer is "not really." There is a lot of different aspects that we take into consideration in terms of grading. So what Davies will look at is improving the quality of assessment within the classroom and revisiting the grading policy to perhaps, make it a proficiency-based grading system. Looking at improving the quality of the assessments, we will be working with a literacy and assessment center in January. We are going to start looking at how to build quality assessments. What is meant by quality assessments is do those assessment truly align and measure proficiency because right now, the assessment system we have is we have the summative assessment and we have interim assessments. The interim assessments is what you would consider the old school quizzes. The summatives are the more wholesome overview of the content; however, right now we can say that some of the summatives measure the proficiency and link to the standards in some departments and may not in other departments. We have to focus on rebuilding those. Part of it isn't rebuilding to just meet proficiency, but also to make it efficient for the teachers. So the teachers know exactly what they are looking for so it isn't an arduous task for them, proficiency as well as efficiency.

Commented [SP1]:

Relative to the grading policy, Ms. Silvia has been researching on different policies offered throughout the state and at charter schools. There are several schools that offer proficiency-based grading system, but the question is how do you implement it at the high school level where GPA's need to be considered for perhaps college-bound students and also class ranks. Some school don't do class ranks, some don't do GPAs. Right now it's about looking at what other schools do and trying to find what would be best for Davies. The way she is envisioning it right now is there is a report out of proficiency for each grade level or standard or task that a student would complete that is linked to the standard. There will be a line that will say, proficient, met, did not meet, and nearly met. Then there is another half of this grading that takes into consideration responsibility, handing in work, quiz grades, so there is a number attached to that portion. There also is a number that is attached to proficiency. How she is looking at it from what she has read, proficiency equals a certain number range. For instance, proficiency in English might mean between a 75 and 80. That number is linked to proficiency and that number is linked to a letter grade to make sure everything is aligned. When teachers are

meeting with students and parents, everyone will have a clear understanding of what that proficiency actually means.

Isn't there judgment involved in creating these? Absolutely and there is no perfect way to measure proficiency but what we can look to do is increase the liability and the validity of the assessments so hopefully working with this assessment center, they will show us how to increase the validity of our assignments and then the reliability comes in with the teacher. That is what we are looking at right now in order to ensure everyone is meeting those standards.

The second change is the diploma system. Not only are the schools to ensure successful course completion of every student, but there is also successful completion of one performance-based assessment. In the past it was two and they also had to meet proficiency on a standardized test like the PARCC in order to graduate. From some pushback from some students, parents and teachers about holding students to a high standard of meeting proficiency on a high stake test, they took away that whole idea and putting more responsibility onto the school districts. "Okay, you don't want a state test to measure, now you have to document measurements in-house. Davies has a senior project and it meets the literacy requirement. We will do away with the student portfolio; however, just because we are going to do away with the portfolio, it doesn't mean we are going to do away with the common task. Davies is looking to develop a CTE mathematics-based common task system. We have the senior project that is 95% literacy based between the senior research paper, the senior presentation, the backboard and the project itself. Now we need a math-based assessment and now get the CTE program involved. There are examples on the handout. There common tasks they have right now when they go on field trips will now have to be more rigorous. Currently, the students go to a company and when they come back, they have to write a reflection paper on what they experienced on the field trip. To be more rigorous, an example would be the machine shop teacher would work with someone at Tiffany's and they draft a problem that the student may encounter on the job which is going to hit a depth of knowledge level of either a 3 or a 4, hitting deep analysis and applied learning skills. It will be numeracy based. It will encourage collaboration between the student, the teacher, and the company.

What is a common task? A common task is a task that is supposed to be linked to the standards that every student, in every grade level should be completing, but this speaks to Mr. Burns' concern about reliability and validity. If every teacher is giving it, how do you ensure there is a little judgment involved as possible, and how do you ensure that each one is given equally. These are the things that we need to look at, but instead of getting the common tasks from the teachers and putting them in a portfolio, we want to use those common tasks as a check-in assessment where teachers, every quarter, give a common task and then come together and look at exemplars to ensure that you have every teacher meeting grading and looking at proficiency the same way. This would happen quarterly for academics and once per semester for CTE depending on the common task they choose to do.

Do we still have the ability to use the PARCC or will we be using the PARCC? At the state level, we have ELA Grade 9 PARCC and we have Algebra I PARCC. We have to offer a couple of students Geometry PARCC because they took Algebra I in 8th grade. This is our grade level assessment for 9th graders. The new assessment for 10th graders is the PSAT. It is free and the parents love that. By the state offering the PSAT, it speaks to, "wow my kid is college-bound because the school is offering the PSAT, so they do have that option." The 11th grade is the SAT. Teachers are concerned about how linearly are they supposed to compare a Grade 9 PARCC test to the 11th grade SAT test? You can't. This isn't the point now. We are not holding the students to this state level assessment for graduation so we can't compare them linearly. What we can do to help ensure the students are going to score at a higher level, because they are all linked to the Common Core Standards, is we can look at our own assessment and our own curriculum and ensure that what we are doing is meeting proficiency. If we are meeting proficiency, then the students will score pretty well on those assessments.

On the second page of the handout, there is list of courses that Davies currently offers. We are looking at the need. We would like to offer a Physics course by 2018 and we have a teacher who is on the path in completing the courses to teach it by 2018. World Languages is looking at writing a curriculum that is more standards-based. The technology that the students are getting is across content. Our teachers have plenty of training in technology but now it is how do we assess their use of technology, another thing we are trying to figure out because the new regs suggest students should be proficient in technology use.

Finally, the third change in the amended regulations is the high school supports for students. How is the high school supporting students performing below grade level, or supporting those at or above grade level, how are they being challenged? There is this Individual Learning Plan (ILP). This ILP will be tracked by Guidance. One of the challenges will be will the sending districts be following an ILP or will Davies have to start one. The idea is the ILP will being in 6th grade so if we have students coming from several different districts, will these districts send their students with their ILP? Will they be the same? Will they be up to par? Another challenge that will have to be faced when we get to it.

What this support system asks is that we implement these research-based early warning systems. The great thing is Davies already offers a lot of them; however, we have to measure the effectiveness of them. We have Academic Recovery, Response to Intervention, Academic Support, Math and Writing Centers, Remedial Reading and Math and we also have the personalized learning environment and advisory time. Out of all of these, we need to look Academic Recovery. We are looking to change AR; if the grading policy is going to change, we will have to change how AR is currently run. We would also like to change the personalized learning environment using advisory time because the new regs speaks to each student having someone they can check in with who will be the liaison between their ILP and what the student is actually doing.

These are the three major changes and they have definitely sparked different feedback from the teachers and we are looking forward to meeting these regulations. Sounds very complicated, but it is doable.

Back to Routine part of the Agenda

D. Recess to Executive Session Pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to Discuss Pending Litigation and Personnel Issues

At 9:00 a.m., Mr. Burns asked for a motion to recess into Executive Session. Dr. Segovis made a motion to recess into Executive Session pursuant to R.I. G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to discuss pending litigation and personnel issues, Mr. Marquis seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

E. Return to Regular Session

At 9:30 a.m., Mr. Burns asked for a motion to return to Regular Session. Dr. Segovis made the motion to return to Regular Session; Mr. Marquis seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Burns asked for a motion to seal the minutes of the Executive Session; Dr. Segovis made the motion; Mr. Marquis seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

IV Adjournment

At 9:31 a.m., Mr. Burns motioned to adjourn and all were in favor.